arXiv:0709.0325v2 [math.RA] 22 Feb 2009

ORE EXTENSIONS OF PRINCIPALLY QUASI-BAER RINGS

Mohamed Louzari and L'moufadal Ben Yakoub
Dept. of Mathematics, Abdelmalek Essaadi University
Faculty of sciences, B.P. 2121 Tetouan, Morocco
mlouzari@yahoo.com, benyakoub@hotmail.com

Abstract. Let R be a ring and (σ,δ) a quasi-derivation of R. In this paper, we show that if R is an (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz ring and satisfies the condition $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$, then R is right p.q.-Baer if and only if the Ore extension $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ is right p.q.-Baer. As a consequence we obtain a generalization of [11].

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, R denotes an associative ring with unity. For a subset X of R, $r_R(X)=\{a\in R|Xa=0\}$ and $\ell_R(X)=\{a\in R|aX=0\}$ will stand for the right and the left annihilator of X in R respectively. By Kaplansky [12], a right annihilator of X is always a right ideal, and if X is a right ideal then $r_R(X)$ is a two-sided ideal. An Ore extension of a ring R is denoted by $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$, where σ is an endomorphism of R and δ is a σ-derivation, i.e., $\delta\colon R\to R$ is an additive map such that $\delta(ab)=\sigma(a)\delta(b)+\delta(a)b$ for all $a,b\in R$ (the pair (σ,δ) is also called a quasi-derivation of R). Recall that elements of $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ are polynomials in x with coefficients written on the left. Multiplication in $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ is given by the multiplication in R and the condition $xa=\sigma(a)x+\delta(a)$, for all $a\in R$. We say that a subset X of R is (σ,δ)-*stable* if $\sigma(X)\subseteq X$ and $\delta(X)\subseteq X$. Recall that a ring R is (*quasi*)-*Baer* if the right annihilator of every (right ideal) nonempty subset of R is generated by an idempotent. Kaplansky [12], introduced Baer rings to abstract various property of AW^*-algebras and Von Neumann algebras. Clark [7], defined quasi-Baer rings and used them to characterize when a finite dimensional algebra with unity over an algebraically closed field

---

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 16S36.
Key words and phrases. p.q.-Baer rings, Ore extensions, (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz rings, (σ,δ)-compatible rings, σ-rigid rings.

is isomorphic to a twisted matrix units semigroup algebra. Another generalization of Baer rings are the p.p.-rings. A ring R is a right (respectively, left) *p.p.-ring* if the right (respectively, left) annihilator of an element of R is generated by an idempotent (right p.p.-rings are also known as the right Rickart rings). R is called a *p.p.-ring* if it is both right and left p.p.-ring. Birkenmeier et al. [4], introduced principally quasi-Baer rings and used them to generalize many results on reduced p.p.-rings. A ring is called *right principally quasi-Baer* (or simply *right p.q.-Baer*) if the right annihilator of a principal right ideal is generated by an idempotent. Similarly, left p.q.-Baer rings can be defined. A ring R is called *p.q.-Baer* if it is both right and left p.q.-Baer. For more details and examples of right p.q.-Baer rings, see Birkenmeier et al. [4].

From Birkenmeier et al. [3], an idempotent $e \in R$ is left (respectively, right) *semicentral* in R if $ere = re$ (respectively, $ere = er$), for all $r \in R$. Equivalently, $e^2 = e \in R$ is left (respectively, right) semicentral if eR (respectively, Re) is an ideal of R. Since the right annihilator of a right ideal is an ideal, we see that the right annihilator of a right ideal is generated by a left semicentral in a quasi-Baer (p.q.-Baer) ring. We use $\mathcal{S}_\ell(R)$ and $\mathcal{S}_r(R)$ for the sets of all left and right semicentral idempotents, respectively. Also note $\mathcal{S}_\ell(R) \cap \mathcal{S}_r(R) = \mathcal{B}(R)$, where $\mathcal{B}(R)$ is the set of all central idempotents of R. If R is a semiprime ring then $\mathcal{S}_\ell(R) = \mathcal{S}_r(R) = \mathcal{B}(R)$. Recall that R is a *reduced* ring if it has no nonzero nilpotent elements. A ring R is *abelian* if every idempotent of R is central. We can easily observe that every reduced ring is abelian.

According to Krempa [13], an endomorphism σ of a ring R is called *rigid* if $a\sigma(a) = 0$ implies $a = 0$ for all $a \in R$. We call a ring R *σ-rigid* if there exists a rigid endomorphism σ of R. Note that any rigid endomorphism of a ring R is a monomorphism and σ-rigid rings are reduced by Hong et al. [11]. A ring R is called *Armendariz* (respectively, *σ-skew Armendariz*) if whenever polynomials $f = \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i x^i,\ g = \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j x^j$ in $R[x]$ (respectively, $R[x;\sigma]$) satisfy $fg = 0$ then $a_i b_j = 0$ (respectively, $a_i \sigma^i(b_j) = 0$) for each i, j. From Hashemi and Moussavi [9], a ring R is called an *(σ, δ)-skew Armendariz* ring if for $p = \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i x^i$ and $q = \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j x^j$ in $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$, $pq = 0$ implies $a_i x^i b_j x^j = 0$ for each i, j. Note that (σ, δ)-skew Armendariz rings are generalization of σ-skew Armendariz rings, σ-rigid rings and Armendariz rings, see Hong et al. [10], for more details. Following Hashemi and Moussavi [8], a ring R is *σ-compatible* if for each $a, b \in R$, $a\sigma(b) = 0 \Leftrightarrow ab = 0$. Moreover, R is said to be *δ-compatible* if for each $a, b \in R$, $ab = 0 \Rightarrow a\delta(b) = 0$. If R is both σ-compatible and δ-compatible, we say that R is *(σ, δ)-compatible.*

Birkenmeier et al. [5, Theorem 3.1], have proved that R is right p.q.-Baer if and only if $R[x]$ is right p.q.-Baer. Hong et al. [11, Corollary 15], have showed that, if R is σ-rigid, then R is right p.q.-Baer if and only if $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ is right p.q.-Baer. Also, Hashemi and Moussavi in [8, Corollary 2.8], have proved that under the (σ,δ)-compatibility assumption on the ring R, R is right p.q.-Baer if and only if $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ is right p.q.Baer.

In this paper, we prove that if R is an (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz ring and satisfies the condition $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$ (see Definition 1), then R is right p.q.-Baer if and only if the Ore extension $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ is right p.q.-Baer. If R is a σ-rigid ring then R is (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz ring and satisfies the condition $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$. So that we obtain a generalization of [11, Corollary 15].

2. Preliminaries and Examples

For any $0 \leq i \leq j$ $(i,j \in \mathbb{N})$, $f_i^j \in End(R,+)$ will denote the map which is the sum of all possible words in σ,δ built with i letters σ and $j-i$ letters δ (e.g., $f_n^n = \sigma^n$ and $f_0^n = \delta^n, n \in \mathbb{N}$). For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in R$ we have $x^n r = \sum_{i=0}^n f_i^n(r)x^i$ in the ring $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ (see [14, Lemma 4.1]).

Lemma 2.1. *Let R be a ring and $a,b,c \in R$ such that $b \in r_R(cR) = eR$ and Re is (σ,δ)-stable for some $e \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(R)$. Then:*
(i) $c\sigma(ab) = c\delta(ab) = 0$;
(ii) $cf_k^j(ab) = 0$, for all $0 \leq k \leq j$ $(k,j \in \mathbb{N})$.

Proof. *(i) $c\sigma(ab) = c\sigma(a)\sigma(b)$, but $b = eb$, so $c\sigma(ab) = c\sigma(a)\sigma(e)\sigma(b)$, since $\sigma(e) = \sigma(e)e$. Then $c\sigma(ab) = c\sigma(a)\sigma(e)e\sigma(b) = 0$, because $e \in r_R(cR)$. Also $c\delta(ab) = c\delta(aeb) = c\sigma(ae)\delta(b) + c\delta(ae)b$, but $c\delta(ae)b = 0$. So $c\delta(ab) = c\sigma(ae)\delta(b) = c\sigma(a)\sigma(e)e\delta(b) = 0$.*
(ii) It follows from (i). □

Definition 1. *Let σ be an endomorphism of a ring R. We say that R satisfies the condition $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$ if whenever $a\sigma(b) = 0$ with $a,b \in R$, then $ab = 0$.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let σ be an endomorphism of a ring R. The following are equivalent:*
(i) R satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$ and reduced;
(ii) R is σ-rigid.

Proof. *Let $a \in R$ such that $a\sigma(a) = 0$ then $a^2 = 0$, since R is reduced so $a = 0$. Conversely, let $a,b \in R$ such that $a\sigma(b) = 0$ then $ba\sigma(ba) = 0$, since R is σ-rigid (so reduced) then $ba = ab = 0$.* □

Lemma 2.3. *Let R be a ring, σ an endomorphism of R and δ be a σ-derivation of R. If R is (σ, δ)-compatible. Then for $a, b \in R$, $ab = 0$ implies $af_i^j(b) = 0$ for all $j \geq i \geq 0$.*

Proof. *If $ab = 0$, then $a\sigma^i(b) = a\delta^j(b) = 0$ for all $i \geq 0$ and $j \geq 0$, because R is (σ, δ)-compatible. Then $af_i^j(b) = 0$ for all i, j.* $\square$

There is an example of a ring R and an endomorphism σ of R such that R is σ-skew Armendariz and R is not σ-compatible.

Example 1. *Consider a ring of polynomials over $\mathbb{Z}_2$, $R = \mathbb{Z}_2[x]$. Let $\sigma\colon R \to R$ be an endomorphism defined by $\sigma(f(x)) = f(0)$. Then:*
(i) R is not σ-compatible. Let $f = \overline{1} + x$, $g = x \in R$, we have $fg = (\overline{1} + x)x \neq 0$, however $f\sigma(g) = (\overline{1} + x)\sigma(x) = 0$.
(ii) R is σ-skew Armendariz [10, Example 5].

In the next example, $S = R/I$ is a ring and $\overline{\sigma}$ an endomorphism of S such that S is $\overline{\sigma}$-compatible and not $\overline{\sigma}$-skew Armendariz.

Example 2. *Let $\mathbb{Z}$ be the ring of integers and $\mathbb{Z}_4$ be the ring of integers modulo 4. Consider the ring*

$$R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & \overline{b} \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} | a \in \mathbb{Z} \,, \overline{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_4 \right\}.$$

Let $\sigma\colon R \to R$ be an endomorphism defined by $\sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} a & \overline{b} \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} a & -\overline{b} \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}$. Take the ideal $I = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & \overline{0} \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} | a \in 4\mathbb{Z} \right\}$ of R. Consider the factor ring

$$R/I \cong \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \overline{a} & \overline{b} \\ 0 & \overline{a} \end{pmatrix} | \overline{a}, \overline{b} \in 4\mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

(i) R/I is not $\overline{\sigma}$-skew Armendariz. In fact, $\left(\begin{pmatrix} \overline{2} & \overline{0} \\ 0 & \overline{2} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \overline{2} & \overline{1} \\ 0 & \overline{2} \end{pmatrix} x\right)^2 = 0 \in (R/I)[x; \overline{\sigma}]$, but $\begin{pmatrix} \overline{2} & \overline{1} \\ 0 & \overline{2} \end{pmatrix} \overline{\sigma} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{2} & \overline{0} \\ 0 & \overline{2} \end{pmatrix} \neq 0$.
(ii) R/I is $\overline{\sigma}$-compatible. Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{a} & \overline{b} \\ 0 & \overline{a} \end{pmatrix}$, $B = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{a'} & \overline{b'} \\ 0 & \overline{a'} \end{pmatrix} \in R/I$. If $AB = 0$ then $\overline{aa'} = 0$ and $\overline{ab'} = \overline{ba'} = 0$, so that $A\overline{\sigma}(B) = 0$. The same for the converse. Therefore R/I is $\overline{\sigma}$-compatible.

Example 3. *Consider the ring*

$$R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & t \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} | a \in \mathbb{Z} \,, t \in \mathbb{Q} \right\},$$

where $\mathbb{Z}$ *and* $\mathbb{Q}$ *are the set of all integers and all rational numbers, respectively. The ring* R *is commutative, let* $\sigma\colon R \to R$ *be an automorphism defined by* $\sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} a & t \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} a & t/2 \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}$.

(i) R *is not* σ*-rigid.* $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & t \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & t \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = 0$*, but* $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & t \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0$*, if* $t \neq 0$.

(ii) $\sigma(Re) \subseteq Re$ *for all* $e \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(R)$*.* R *has only two idempotents,* $e_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ *end* $e_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$*, let* $r = \begin{pmatrix} a & t \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \in R$*, we have* $\sigma(re_0) \in Re_0$ *and* $\sigma(re_1) \in Re_1$.

(iii) R *satisfies the condition* $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$*. Let* $\begin{pmatrix} a & t \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}$ *and* $\begin{pmatrix} b & x \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix} \in R$ *such that*

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & t \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} b & x \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix}\right) = 0,$$

hence $ab = 0 = ax/2 + tb$*, so* $a = 0$ *or* $b = 0$*. In each case,* $ax + tb = 0$*, hence* $\begin{pmatrix} a & t \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} b & x \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix} = 0$*. Therefore* R *satisfies* $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$.

(iv) R *is* σ*-skew Armendariz* [11, Example 1].

3. Ore extensions over right p.q.-Baer rings

The principally quasi-Baerness of a ring R do not inherit the Ore extensions of R. The following example shows that, there exists an endomorphism σ of a ring R such that R is right p.q.-Baer, Re is σ-stable for all $e \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(R)$ and not satisfying $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$, but $R[x;\sigma]$ is not right p.q.-Baer.

Example 4. *Let* $\mathbb{K}$ *be a field and* $R = \mathbb{K}[t]$ *a polynomial ring over* $\mathbb{K}$ *with the endomorphism* σ *given by* $\sigma(f(t)) = f(0)$ *for all* $f(t) \in R$*. Then* R *is a principal ideal domain so right p.q.-Baer.*

(i) $R[x;\sigma]$ *is not right p.q.-Baer. Consider a right ideal* $xR[x;\sigma]$*. Then* $x\{f_0(t) + f_1(t)x + \cdots + f_n(t)x^n\} = f_0(0)x + f_1(0)x^2 + \cdots + f_n(0)x^{n+1}$ *for all* $f_0(t) + f_1(t)x + \cdots + f_n(t)x^n \in R[x;\sigma]$ *and hence* $xR[x;\sigma] = \{a_1x + a_2x^2 + \cdots + a_nx^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N},\ a_i \in \mathbb{K}\ (i = 0, 1, \cdots, n)\}$*. Note that* $R[x;\sigma]$ *has only two idempotents 0 and 1 by simple computation. Since* $(a_1x + a_2x^2 + \cdots + a_nx^n)1 = a_1x + a_2x^2 + \cdots + a_nx^n \neq 0$ *for some nonzero element* $a_1x + a_2x^2 + \cdots + a_nx^n \in xR[x;\sigma]$*, we get* $1 \notin r_{R[x;\sigma]}(xR[x;\sigma])$ *and so* $r_{R[x;\sigma]}(xR[x;\sigma]) \neq R[x;\sigma]$*. Also, since* $(a_1x + a_2x^2 + \cdots + a_nx^n)t = 0$ *for all* $a_1x + a_2x^2 + \cdots + a_nx^n \in xR[x;\sigma]$*,* $t \in r_{R[x;\sigma]}(xR[x;\sigma])$ *and hence* $r_{R[x;\sigma]}(xR[x;\sigma]) \neq 0$*. Thus* $r_{R[x;\sigma]}(xR[x;\sigma])$ *is not generated by an idempotent. Therefore* $R[x;\sigma]$ *is not a right p.q.-Baer ring,* [6,

Example 2.8].
(ii) R does not satisfy the condition $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$. *Take* $f = a_0 + a_1t + a_2t^2 + \cdots + a_nt^n$ *and* $g = b_1t + b_2t^2 + \cdots + b_mt^m$, *since* $g(0) = 0$ *so,* $f\sigma(g) = 0$, *but* $fg \neq 0$.
(iii) R has only two idempotents 0 *and* 1 *so* Re *is* σ*-stable for all* $e \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(R)$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let* R *be a ring and* (σ, δ) *a quasi-derivation of* R. *Assume that* Re *is* (σ, δ)*-stable for all* $e \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(R)$ *and* R *satisfies the condition* $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$. *If* R *is right p.q.-Baer then so is* $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$.

Proof. *The idea of proof is similar to that of* [5, Theorem 3.1]. *Let* $S = R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ *and* $p(x) = c_0 + c_1x + \cdots + c_nx^n \in S$. *There is* $e_i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(R)$ *such that* $r_R(c_iR) = e_iR$, *for* $i = 0, 1, \cdots, n$. *Let* $e = e_ne_{n-1}\cdots e_0$, *then* $e \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(R)$ *and* $eR = \bigcap_{i=0}^n r_R(c_iR)$.
Claim 1. $eS \subseteq r_S(p(x)S)$.
Let $\varphi(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_mx^m \in S$, *we have*

$$p(x)\varphi(x)e = (\sum_{i=0}^n c_ix^i)(\sum_{k=0}^m(\sum_{j=k}^m a_kf_k^j(e)x^k)),$$

since Re *is* f_k^j*-stable* $(0 \leq k \leq j)$, *we have* $f_k^j(e) = u_k^je$ *for some* $u_k^j \in R$ $(0 \leq k \leq j)$. *So* $p(x)\varphi(x)e = (\sum_{i=0}^n c_ix^i)(\sum_{k=0}^m(\sum_{j=k}^m a_ku_k^je)x^k)$, *if we set* $\sum_{j=k}^m a_ku_k^j = \alpha_k$, *then*

$$p(x)\varphi(x)e = (\sum_{i=0}^n c_ix^i)(\sum_{k=0}^m \alpha_kex^k) = \sum_{i=0}^n\sum_{k=0}^m(c_i\sum_{j=0}^i f_j^i(\alpha_ke))x^{j+k},$$

but $eR \subseteq r_R(c_iR)$, *for* $i = 0, 1, \cdots n$. *So* $p(x)\varphi(x)e = 0$. *Therefore* $eS \subseteq r_S(p(x)S)$.
Claim 2. $r_S(p(x)R) \subseteq eS$.
Let $\varphi(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_mx^m \in r_S(p(x)R)$. *Since* $p(x)R\varphi(x) = 0$, *we have* $p(x)b\varphi(x) = 0$ *for all* $b \in R$. *Thus*

$$\sum_{i=0}^n\sum_{k=0}^m(c_i\sum_{j=0}^i f_j^i(ba_k))x^{j+k} = 0.$$

So, we have the following system of equations:

$$c_n\sigma^n(ba_m) = 0; \tag{0}$$

$$c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-1}) + c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(ba_m) + c_nf_{n-1}^n(ba_m) = 0; \tag{1}$$

$$c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-2}) + c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(ba_{m-1}) + c_nf_{n-1}^n(ba_{m-1}) + c_{n-2}\sigma^{n-2}(ba_m) \tag{2}$$

$$+c_{n-1}f_{n-2}^{n-1}(ba_m)+c_nf_{n-2}^{n}(ba_m)=0;$$

$$\begin{gathered} c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-3})+c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(ba_{m-2})+c_nf_{n-1}^{n}(ba_{m-2})+c_{n-2}\sigma^{n-2}(ba_{m-1}) \\ +c_{n-1}f_{n-2}^{n-1}(ba_{m-1})+c_nf_{n-2}^{n}(ba_{m-1})+c_{n-3}\sigma^{n-3}(ba_m)+c_{n-2}f_{n-3}^{n-2}(ba_m) \\ +c_{n-1}f_{n-3}^{n-1}(ba_m)+c_nf_{n-3}^{n}(ba_m)=0; \end{gathered} \tag{3}$$

$$\cdots$$

$$\sum_{j+k=\ell}\ \sum_{i=0}^{n}\sum_{k=0}^{m}(c_i\sum_{j=0}^{i}f_j^i(ba_k))=0; \tag{ℓ}$$

$$\cdots$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n}c_i\delta^i(ba_0)=0. \tag{$n+m$}$$

From eq. (0), *we have* $c_nba_m=0$ *then* $a_m\in r_R(c_nR)=e_nR$. *Since* $c_nba_m=0$, *so in eq.* (1), *by Lemma 2.1, we have* $c_nf_{n-1}^n(ba_m)=0$ *and eq.* (1) *simplifies to*

$$c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-1})+c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(ba_m)=0. \tag{$1'$}$$

Let $s\in R$ *and take* $b=se_n$ *in eq.* ($1'$). *Then*

$$c_n\sigma^n(se_na_{m-1})+c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_na_m)=0.$$

But $c_nse_na_{m-1}=0$, *so* $c_n\sigma^n(se_na_{m-1})=0$. *Thus* $c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_na_m)=0$, *so* $c_{n-1}se_na_m=0$ *but* $e_na_m=a_m$, *the eq.* ($1'$) *yields* $c_{n-1}sa_m=0$. *Hence* $a_m\in r_R(c_{n-1}R)$, *thus* $a_m\in e_ne_{n-1}R$ *and so* $c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-1})=0$, *so* $c_nba_{m-1}=0$, *thus* $a_{m-1}\in e_nR=r_R(c_nR)$.

Now in eq. (2), *since* $c_nba_{m-1}=c_{n-1}ba_m=c_nb_m=0$, *because* $a_m\in r_R(c_nR)\cap r_R(c_{n-1}R)$ *and* $a_{m-1}\in r_R(c_nR)$. *By Lemma 2.1, we have*

$$c_nf_{n-1}^n(ba_{m-1})=c_{n-1}f_{n-2}^{n-1}(ba_m)=c_nf_{n-2}^n(ba_m)=0,$$

because $a_m\in e_ne_{n-1}R$ *and* $a_{m-1}\in e_nR$. *So, eq.* (2), *simplifies to*

$$c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-2})+c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(ba_{m-1})+c_{n-2}\sigma^{n-2}(ba_m)=0. \tag{$2'$}$$

In eq. ($2'$), *take* $b=se_ne_{n-1}$. *Then*

$$c_n\sigma^n(se_ne_{n-1}a_{m-2})+c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_ne_{n-1}a_{m-1})+c_{n-2}\sigma^{n-2}(se_ne_{n-1}a_m)=0.$$

But

$$c_n\sigma^n(se_ne_{n-1}a_{m-2})=c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_ne_{n-1}a_{m-1})=0.$$

Hence $c_{n-2}\sigma^{n-2}(se_ne_{n-1}a_m)=0$, *so* $c_{n-2}se_ne_{n-1}a_m=c_{n-2}sa_m=0$, *thus* $a_m\in r_R(c_{n-2}R)=e_{n-2}R$ *and so* $a_m\in e_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}R$. *The eq.* ($2'$) *becomes*

$$c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-2})+c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(ba_{m-1})=0. \tag{$2''$}$$

Take $b = se_n$ *in eq.* $(2'')$, *so* $c_n\sigma^n(se_na_{m-2}) + c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_na_{m-1}) = 0$, *then* $c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_na_{m-1}) = 0$ *because* $c_n\sigma^n(se_na_{m-2}) = 0$, *thus*

$$c_{n-1}se_na_{m-1} = c_{n-1}sa_{m-1} = 0,$$

then $a_{m-1} \in r_R(c_{n-1}R) = e_{n-1}R$ *and so* $a_{m-1} \in e_ne_{n-1}R$. *From eq.* $(2'')$, *we obtain also* $c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-2}) = 0 = c_nba_{m-2}$, *so* $a_{m-2} \in e_nR$. *Summarizing at this point, we have*

$$a_m \in e_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}R, \quad a_{m-1} \in e_ne_{n-1}R \quad \text{and } a_{m-2} \in e_nR.$$

Now in eq. (3), *since*

$$c_nba_{m-2} = c_{n-1}ba_{m-1} = c_nba_{m-1} = c_{n-2}ba_m = c_{n-1}ba_m = c_nba_m = 0.$$

because $a_m \in r_R(c_nR) \cap r_R(c_{n-1}R) \cap r_R(c_{n-2}R)$, $a_{m-1} \in r_R(c_nR) \cap r_R(c_{n-1}R)$ *and* $a_{m-2} \in r_R(c_nR)$. *By Lemma 2.1, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} c_nf^n_{n-1}(ba_{m-2}) = c_{n-1}f^{n-1}_{n-2}(ba_{m-1}) = c_nf^n_{n-2}(ba_{m-1}) = c_{n-2}f^{n-2}_{n-3}(ba_m) \\ = c_{n-1}f^{n-1}_{n-3}(ba_m) = c_nf^n_{n-3}(ba_m) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

because $a_{m-2} \in r_R(c_nR)$, $a_{m-1} \in r_R(c_nR) \cap r_R(c_{n-1}R)$ *and* $a_m \in r_R(c_nR) \cap r_R(c_{n-1}R) \cap r_R(c_{n-2}R)$. *So eq.* (3) *becomes*

$$\begin{aligned} c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-3}) + c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(ba_{m-2}) + +c_{n-2}\sigma^{n-2}(ba_{m-1}) \\ +c_{n-3}\sigma^{n-3}(ba_m) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3'}$$

Let $b = se_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}$ *in eq.* $(3')$, *we obtain*

$$\begin{aligned} c_n\sigma^n(se_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}a_{m-3}) + c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}a_{m-2}) \\ +c_{n-2}\sigma^{n-2}(se_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}a_{m-1}) + c_{n-3}\sigma^{n-3}(se_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}a_m) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By the above results, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_n\sigma^n(se_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}a_{m-3}) = c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}a_{m-2}) \\ = c_{n-2}\sigma^{n-2}(se_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}a_{m-1}) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

then $c_{n-3}\sigma^{n-3}(se_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}a_m) = 0$, *so* $c_{n-3}se_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}a_m = c_{n-3}sa_m = 0$, *hence* $a_m \in e_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}e_{n-3}R$, *and eq.* $(3')$ *simplifies to*

$$c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-3}) + c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(ba_{m-2}) + c_{n-2}\sigma^{n-2}(ba_{m-1}) = 0. \tag{3''}$$

In eq. $(3'')$ *substitute* se_ne_{n-1} *for* b *to obtain*

$$c_n\sigma^n(se_ne_{n-1}a_{m-3}) + c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_ne_{n-1}a_{m-2}) + c_{n-2}\sigma^{n-2}(se_ne_{n-1}a_{m-1}) = 0.$$

But

$$c_n\sigma^n(se_ne_{n-1}a_{m-3}) = c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_ne_{n-1}a_{m-3}) = 0.$$

So $c_{n-2}\sigma^{n-2}(se_ne_{n-1}a_{m-1}) = 0 = c_{n-2}se_ne_{n-1}a_{m-1} = c_{n-2}sa_{m-1}$. *Hence* $a_{m-1} \in e_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}R$, *and eq.* $(3'')$ *simplifies to*

$$c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-3}) + c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(ba_{m-2}) = 0. \tag{3'''}$$

In eq. $(3''')$ *substitute* se_n *for* b *to obtain*

$$c_n\sigma^n(se_na_{m-3}) + c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_na_{m-2}) = 0.$$

But $c_n\sigma^n(se_na_{m-3}) = 0$, *so* $c_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}(se_na_{m-2}) = 0 = c_{n-1}se_na_{m-2} = c_{n-1}sa_{m-2}$. *Hence* $a_{m-2} \in e_ne_{n-1}R$, *and eq.* $(3''')$ *simplifies to*

$$c_n\sigma^n(ba_{m-3}) = 0,$$

then $c_nba_{m-3} = 0$. *Hence* $a_{m-3} \in e_nR$.

Summarizing at this point, we have

$$a_m \in e_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}e_{n-3}R,\ a_{m-1} \in e_ne_{n-1}e_{n-2}R,\ a_{m-2} \in e_ne_{n-1}R,$$

and $a_{m-3} \in e_nR$. *Continuing this procedure yields* $a_i \in eR$ *for all* $i = 0, 1, \cdots, m$. *Hence* $\varphi(x) \in eR[x;\sigma,\delta]$. *Consequently,* $r_S(p(x)R) \subseteq eS$. *Finally, by Claims 1 and 2, we have* $r_S(p(x)R) \subseteq eS \subseteq r_S(p(x)S)$. *Also, since* $p(x)R \subseteq p(x)S$, *we have* $r_S(p(x)S) \subseteq r_S(p(x)R)$. *Thus* $r_S(p(x)S) = eS$. *Therefore* $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ *is right p.q.-Baer.* □

From Example 4, we can see that the condition "R satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$" in Proposition 3.1 is not superfluous. On the other hand, there is an example which satisfies all the hypothesis of Proposition 3.1.

Example 5. [8, Example 1.1]. *Let* R_1 *be a right p.q.-Baer,* D *a domain and* $R = T_n(R_1) \oplus D[y]$, *where* $T_n(R_1)$ *is the upper* $n \times n$ *triangular matrix ring over* R_1. *Let* $\sigma\colon D[y] \to D[y]$ *be a monomorphism which is not surjective. Then we have the following:*
(i) R *is right p.q.-Baer. By* [4], $T_n(R_1)$ *is right p.q.-Baer and hence* $T_n(R_1) \oplus D[y]$ *is right p.q.-Baer.*
(ii) R *satisfies the condition* $(\mathcal{C}_{\overline{\sigma}})$. *Let* $\overline{\sigma}\colon R \to R$ *be an endomorphism defined by* $\overline{\sigma}(A \oplus f(y)) = A \oplus \sigma(f(y))$ *for each* $A \in T_n(R_1)$ *and* $f(y) \in D[y]$. *Suppose that* $(A \oplus f(y))\overline{\sigma}(B \oplus g(y)) = 0$. *Then* $AB = 0$ *and* $f(y)\sigma(g(y)) = 0$. *Since* $D[y]$ *is a domain and* σ *is a monomorphism,* $f(y) = 0$ *or* $g(y) = 0$. *Hence* $(A \oplus f(y))(B \oplus g(y)) = 0$.
(iii) Re *is* $\overline{\sigma}$*-stable for all* $e \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(R)$. *Idempotents of* R *are of the form* $e_0 = A \oplus 0$ *and* $e_1 = A \oplus 1$, *for some idempotent* $A \in T_n(R_1)$. *Since* $\overline{\sigma}(e_0) = e_0$ *and* $\overline{\sigma}(e_1) = e_1$, *we have the stability desired. Note that* R *is not reduced, and hence it is not* $\overline{\sigma}$*-rigid.*

Corollary 3.2. *Let* (σ,δ) *be a quasi-derivation of a ring* R. *Assume that* R *is right p.q.-Baer, if* R *satisfies one of the following:*
(i) R *is* (σ,δ)*-skew Armendariz and satisfies* $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$;
(ii) $\mathcal{S}_\ell(R) = \mathcal{B}(R)$, $\sigma(Re) \subseteq Re$ *for all* $e \in \mathcal{B}(R)$ *and* R *satisfies* $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$;
(iii) R *is* σ*-rigid.*
Then $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ *is right p.q.-Baer.*

Proof. *(i) By* [9, Lemma 4]*, Re is (σ,δ)-stable for all $e \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(R)$.*
(ii) It follows from Proposition 3.1 and [2, Lemma 2.3].
(iii) Follows from Lemma 2.2 and [2, Lemma 2.5]. □

Now, we focus on the converse of Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 3.3. *Let (σ,δ) a quasi-derivation of a ring R such that R is (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz. If $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ is right p.q.-Baer then R is right p.q.-Baer.*

Proof. *Let $S = R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $a \in R$. By* [9, Lemma 5]*, there exists $e \in \mathcal{S}_\ell(R)$, such that $r_S(aS) = eS$, in particular $aRe = 0$, then $e \in r_R(aR)$, also $eR \subseteq r_R(aR)$. Conversely, if $b \in r_R(aR)$, we have $aRb = 0$, then $b = ef$ for some $f = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 x + \alpha_2 x^2 + \cdots + \alpha_n x^n \in S$, but $b \in R$, thus $b = e\alpha_0$. Therefore $b \in eR$. So that $r_R(aR) = eR$.*

□

Theorem 3.4. *Let (σ,δ) a quasi-derivation of a ring R such that R is (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz and satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$. Then R is right p.q.-Baer if and only if $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ is right p.q.-Baer.*

Proof. *It follows immediately from Corollary 3.2 and Proposition 3.3.*
□

Corollary 3.5 ([11, Corollary 15])**.** *Let R be a ring, σ an endomorphism and δ be a σ-derivation of R. If R is σ-rigid, then R is right p.q.-Baer if and only if $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ is right p.q.-Baer.*

From Example 3, we see that Theorem 3.4 is a generalization of [11, Corollary 15]. There is an example of a ring R and a quasi-derivation (σ,δ), which satisfies all the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4.

Example 6 ([2, Example 3.11])**.** *Let $R = \mathbb{C}$ where $\mathbb{C}$ is the field of complex numbers. Define $\sigma\colon R \to R$ and $\delta\colon R \to R$ by $\sigma(z) = \overline{z}$ and $\delta(z) = z - \overline{z}$, where $\overline{z}$ is the conjugate of z. σ is an automorphism of R and δ is a σ-derivation. We have*
(i) R is Baer (so right p.q.-Baer) reduced;
(ii) R is σ-rigid, then it is (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz and satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$.

Remark. *Example 1, shows that Theorem 3.4 is not a consequence of* [8, Corollary 2.8].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the integrated action Moroccan-Spanish A/5037/06. The second author wishes to thank Professor Amin Kaidi of Universidad de Almería for his generous hospitality.

References

[1] S. Annin, '*Associated primes over skew polynomial rings*', Comm. Algebra, 30(5) (2002), 2511-2528.

[2] L. Ben Yakoub, M. Louzari, '*On quasi-Baer rings of Ore extensions*', East-West J. of Mathematics 8(2) (2006), 119-127.

[3] G.F. Birkenmeier, J.Y. Kim, J.K. Park, '*Polynomial extensions of Baer and quasi-Baer rings*', J. Pure appl. Algebra 159 (2001), 25-42.

[4] G.F. Birkenmeier, J.Y. Kim, J.K. Park, '*Principally quasi-Baer rings*', Comm. Algebra 29(2) (2001), 639-660.

[5] G.F. Birkenmeier, J.Y. Kim, J.K. Park, '*On polynomial extensions of principally quasi-Baer rings*', Kyungpook Math. journal 40(2) (2000), 247-253.

[6] J. Han, Y. Hirano, H. Kim, *Some results on skew polynomial rings over a reduced ring*, In: G. F. Birkenmeier, J. K. Park, Y. S. Park (Eds), 'The international symposium on ring theory', In: Trends in math., Birkhäuser Boston, (2001).

[7] W.E. Clark, '*Twisted matrix units semigroup algebras*', Duke Math.Soc., 35 (1967), 417-424.

[8] E. Hashemi, A. Moussavi, '*Polynomial extensions of quasi-Baer rings*, Acta. Math. Hungar. 107 (3) (2005) 207-224.

[9] E. Hashemi, A. Moussavi, '*On (σ, δ)-skew Armendariz rings*' , J. Korean Math. soc. 42(2) (2005), 353-363.

[10] C. Y. Hong, N.K. Kim, T. K. Kwak, '*On Skew Armendariz Rings*', Comm. Algebra 31(1) (2003), 103-122.

[11] C. Y. Hong, N. K. Kim, T. K. Kwak, '*Ore extensions of Baer and p.p.-rings*', J. Pure Appl. Algebra 151(3) (2000), 215-226.

[12] I. Kaplansky, *Rings of operators*, Math. Lecture Notes series , Benjamin, New York, 1965.

[13] J. Krempa, '*Some examples of reduced rings*', Algebra Colloq. 3(4) (1996), 289-300.

[14] T. Y. Lam, A. Leroy, J. Matczuk, '*Primeness, semiprimeness and the prime radical of Ore extensions*', Comm. Algebra 25(8) (1997), 2459-2506.